

## **IMAC QA SUBCOMMITTEE MINUTES**

**February 28, 2005**

**Members Present:** John Haine, DHFS; Lisa Hanson, DHFS; Pam Lohaus, DHFS; Brian Fangmeier, DHFS; Marcia Williamson, DHFS; Chris Elms, Dane County; Marilyn Rudd, DHFS; Vickie Jessup, DHFS; Jackie Bennett, Racine County; Jacaie Coutant, Milwaukee County; Kathy Judd, Dane County; Allison Espeseth, Covering Kids & Family

**Via Conference Call:** Joanne Ator, Door County; Lorie Mueller, La Crosse County; Jennifer Winter, Managed Health Services Managed Care

**Absent:** Bernadette Connolly, DHFS

### **Agenda Items for this month's meeting:**

**I. Meeting Minutes Review:** The meeting minutes from the January 24, 2004 meeting were reviewed and several edits recommended.

**II. Food Stamp 2<sup>nd</sup> party review status reports:** Milwaukee is working on the 2nd Party Review Process. In December their completion rate was 38%. There have been some roadblocks since the October implementation. Because of those startup problems, the office delayed the start until December. Milwaukee has been training all supervisors and staff. The new administrator, Corey Hoze, has indicated that supervisors will be held accountable for second party reviews and their performance will be monitored and measured. Supervisors are required to do the 2nd Party Reviews for all staff, but so far some are barely doing any.

The PAC staff that have been retained to assist in the Milwaukee error reduction process have been underutilized because supervisors have not been using them. They have been assigned to a mini find & fix project targeting 15 workers with the highest Find & Fix and QC error rates. They are reviewing all applications, reviews and SMIRFs. They will obtain sufficient data to for Milwaukee administration to use for further steps. It may possibly become a personnel issue.

Balance of the state, Lisa provided a handout with relatively current data on IMQA 2nd Party Review statistics. There are 8 counties who have entered no data for 2004 or 2005. In January and February of 2005, 25 counties have entered no reviews or less than 1% of the required. Central office managers and staff are concerned because this payment accuracy initiative has a definite impact on payment accuracy. Lisa has made contact with some of the agencies in regards to the low utilization of the IMQA data system to find out why their numbers are low or non-existent. What does this workgroup think should be done to encourage agencies to prioritize this important error reduction initiative and contractual requirement?

Among recommendations are:

- When John Haine goes to the local forums to talk about the FS error rate, he could accentuate the importance of this process and it's impact on payment accuracy.
- Some agencies may not be comfortable with the data collection system. Lisa could do training at the regional meetings which could help agencies with the process of entering information into IMQA.
- A status report should be provided to the IMAC
- Area Coordinators could share Lisa's data with their agencies at regional meetings. It's important for agencies to know that someone is really looking at and using this information. They could also

follow up on what may be causing an agency to fail to enter information into IMQA. Are they not doing the reviews; are the reviews done but not getting entered; is there a system access problem, etc.?

**III. Error Rate:** The FS error rate for FFY 2005 will not be final until June after the federal reviewers have completed their re-review of cases. What we have reported to the federal government is 6.5%. That puts us a 1/2 percent over our goal of 6%. We don't expect the regressed rate to drop us far enough to be out of sanction status. In addition, we made a commitment with our last negotiated penalty to reduce our error rate to have a portion of the penalty "forgiven". Failing to meet the target means we will have to pay more of that penalty to the federal government. This was called "At Risk" penalty. We will try to negotiate that penalty because we have substantially improved our error rate over the last several years. In 2002 the error rate was 12.6%, in 2003 it was 9.3% and now we are down to 6.5%.

The first few months of 2005 have also been improved. In October the error rate was 2.57%. This was 3.1% Milwaukee and 1.9% balance of the state.

**IV. MER Status:** MER's are in progress. Marilyn Rudd has been reviewing agency Web sites as part of the MER and has found that most agencies have one. Frequently they include a FoodShare overview. One agency with a high Latino population have a language select on their Web site.

A copy of the draft Quality Assurance Plan (QAP) Administrator's Memo was shared with the workgroup. The memo is expected to be issued soon. No new plan is required for 2005. Agencies will continue to work under their 2004 plan. Agencies that choose to revise their 2004 plan may do so by highlighting the revision and submitting it to Area Coordinators within 60 days of the Memo.

This workgroup will need to begin planning soon for the 2006 QAP. Consistency of the information provided by the agencies is necessary.

**V. Future Projects/Issues:** Possible future issues to consider by this workgroup are:

MEQC

PERM

Second Party Reviews

Training

Alignment of policy

Workload

Benefit Recovery

Next meeting is 3/28/05

Respectfully submitted by Pamela Lohaus